

**REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of April 5, 2004 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 1-20 were presented for examination. These have been rejected as follows: 1) claims 1-12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1 and 19-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,698,644; 2) claims 13 - 20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,352,196; 3) claims 13 - 20 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 12 and 16 - 20 of U.S. Patent No. 6,168,069; 4) claims 1 - 6 and 13 - 20 under 35 USC 102(b) over Matsui et al; 5) claims 1 - 8 and 13 - 20 under 35 USC 102(b) over Welch et al; 6) claims 1 - 4 and 9 - 20 under 35 USC 102(b) over Hussain et al; 7) claims 1 - 4 and 13 - 20 under 35 USC 102(e) over Mori et al; 8) claims 1 - 4 and 13 - 20 under 35 USC 102(e) over Wei; and 9) claims 1 - 8 and 13 - 20 under 35 USC 103(a) over Lynnworth in view of Kluczynski.

Regarding rejections 1) - 3) submitted herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer.

Regarding rejections 4) - 9) these are respectfully traversed.

Matsui et al discloses only a compound arrangement comprising a first component of metal being brazed to a second component of metal (metallized layer 2 brazed to metallic buffer 3, see col. 3, line 43 to col. 4, line 15). Matsui et al does not disclose a first component having an external cylindrical surface touching a cylindrical internal surface of a second component, and they do not disclose that the second component clasps the first component tightly so that the second component exerts compressive stress on the external surface of the first component, as is now claimed in claim 1. Moreover, Matsui et al does not disclose that the second component is slipped on the first component so that the internal (cylindrical) surface touches the external (cylindrical) surface and the second component exerts permanent compressive stress on the first component, as recited in claims 13 and 19.

Because of these differences between the present invention and Matsui et al it is respectfully submitted that Matsui et al cannot anticipate claims 1 - 6 and 13 - 20.

Welch et al does not, it is respectfully submitted teach a compound arrangement of two metallic components. At best Welch et al discloses an arrangement comprising a first component of metal and a second component of a non-metal (a silicon anode is not a metallic component). Moreover, Welch et al does not disclose the compressive stress feature of the present invention.

Because of these differences between the present invention and Welch et al, it is respectfully submitted that Welch et al cannot anticipate claims 1 - 8 and 13 - 20.

Hussain like Matsui et al and Welch et al fails to teach the compressive stress feature of th present invention.


Because of this difference between the present invention and Hussain et al, it is respectfully submitted that Hussain et al cannot anticipate claims 1 - 4 and 9 - 20.

Regarding Lynnworth and Kluczynski these too doe not teach at least the compressive stress feature of the presnt invention. There is no basis, therefore, to conclude that their combination can render claims 1 - 8 and 13 - 20 unpatentable under 35 USC 103.

Also, none of the references of record teach the use of a first and second component as claimed connected to a flow sensor for measuring a fluid conducted in a pipe.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and re-examination are respectfully requested and claims 1 - 54 found allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Felix J. D'Amorosio  
Reg. No. 25,721

Date: July 6, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Alexandria, VA 22314 - 1176  
(703) 683-0500

S:\Prodcert\fd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holdingt GmbH\LORE3001C\response to 04-05-04 OA.wpd